

On hitting all maximum cliques with an independent set

Landon Rabern

landon.rabern@gmail.com

March 16, 2010

Abstract

We prove that every graph G for which $\omega(G) \geq \frac{3}{4}(\Delta(G) + 1)$, has an independent set I such that $\omega(G - I) < \omega(G)$. It follows that a minimum counterexample G to Reed's conjecture satisfies $\omega(G) < \frac{3}{4}(\Delta(G) + 1)$ and hence also $\chi(G) > \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil$. We also prove that if for every induced subgraph H of G we have $\chi(H) \leq \max \left\{ \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(H) \rceil, \left\lceil \frac{\omega(H) + \Delta(H) + 1}{2} \right\rceil \right\}$, then we also have $\chi(G) \leq \left\lceil \frac{\omega(G) + \Delta(G) + 1}{2} \right\rceil$. This gives a generic proof of the upper bound for line graphs of multigraphs proved by King et al.

1 Introduction

Satisfaction. Given a relation R between graph functions we say that a graph G *satisfies* R if plugging G into each function gives a true statement (e.g. G satisfies $\chi \geq \Delta$ means $\chi(G) \geq \Delta(G)$).

We prove the following general lemma and apply it to Reed's conjecture.

The Main Lemma. *If G is a graph satisfying $\omega \geq \frac{3}{4}(\Delta + 1)$, then G has an independent set I such that $\omega(G - I) < \omega(G)$.*

In [9], Reed conjectured the following upper bound on the chromatic number.

Reed's Conjecture. *Every graph satisfies $\chi \leq \left\lceil \frac{\omega + \Delta + 1}{2} \right\rceil$.*

Observation. If we could always find an independent set whose removal decreased both ω and Δ , then the conjecture would follow by simple induction. Expanding the independent set given by The Main Lemma to a maximal one shows that this sort of argument goes through when $\omega \geq \frac{3}{4}(\Delta + 1)$. Thus a minimum counterexample to Reed's conjecture satisfies $\omega < \frac{3}{4}(\Delta + 1)$ and hence also $\chi > \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega \rceil$.

Reed's upper bound was proved for line graphs of multigraphs by King, Reed and Vetta in [4], for quasi-line graphs by King and Reed in [5], and recently King and Reed proved it for all claw-free graphs (see King's thesis [6]). The line graphs of multigraphs result follows from the following theorem.

Theorem D. *If every induced subgraph of a graph G satisfies $\chi \leq \max \{ \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega \rceil, \lceil \frac{\omega + \Delta + 1}{2} \rceil \}$, then G satisfies $\chi \leq \lceil \frac{\omega + \Delta + 1}{2} \rceil$.*

Reed's upper bound for line graphs of multigraphs follows immediately from Theorem D, a bound of Caprara and Rizzi (see [1]) and the bound of Molloy and Reed on fractional colorings (see [8]).

Caprara and Rizzi. *Let H be a multigraph and $G = L(H)$. Then*

$$\chi(G) \leq \max \{ \lfloor 1.1\Delta(H) + 0.7 \rfloor, \lceil \chi^*(G) \rceil \}$$

Fractional Version. *Every graph satisfies $\chi^* \leq \frac{\omega + \Delta + 1}{2}$.*

Since induced subgraphs of line graphs are line graphs, $\Delta(H) \leq \omega(G)$ and $\lfloor 1.1\omega(G) + 0.7 \rfloor \leq \lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \rceil$ we may apply Theorem D and prove the following.

King, Reed and Vetta. *If G is the line graph of a multigraph, then G satisfies $\chi \leq \lceil \frac{\omega + \Delta + 1}{2} \rceil$.*

2 Proof of The Main Lemma

We need three lemmas. The first is due to Hajnal (see [2]).

Lemma 1. *Let G be a graph and $\mathcal{Q}$ a collection of maximum cliques in G . Then*

$$|\bigcap \mathcal{Q}| \geq 2\omega(G) - |\bigcup \mathcal{Q}|.$$

Proof. Assume (to reach a contradiction) that the lemma is false and let $\mathcal{Q}$ be a counterexample with $|\mathcal{Q}|$ minimal. Put $r = |\mathcal{Q}|$ and $\mathcal{Q} = \{Q_1, \dots, Q_r\}$. Consider the set $W = (Q_1 \cap \bigcup_{i=2}^r Q_i) \cup \bigcap_{i=2}^r Q_i$. Plainly, W is a clique. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega(G) &\geq |W| \\
&= \left| (Q_1 \cap \bigcup_{i=2}^r Q_i) \cup \bigcap_{i=2}^r Q_i \right| \\
&= \left| Q_1 \cap \bigcup_{i=2}^r Q_i \right| + \left| \bigcap_{i=2}^r Q_i \right| - \left| \bigcap_{i=1}^r Q_i \cap \bigcup_{i=2}^r Q_i \right| \\
&= |Q_1| + \left| \bigcup_{i=2}^r Q_i \right| - \left| \bigcup_{i=1}^r Q_i \right| + \left| \bigcap_{i=2}^r Q_i \right| - \left| \bigcap_{i=1}^r Q_i \right| \\
&= \omega(G) + \left| \bigcup_{i=2}^r Q_i \right| + \left| \bigcap_{i=2}^r Q_i \right| - \left| \bigcup_{i=1}^r Q_i \right| - \left| \bigcap_{i=1}^r Q_i \right| \\
&\geq \omega(G) + 2\omega(G) - \left| \bigcup_{i=1}^r Q_i \right| - \left| \bigcap_{i=1}^r Q_i \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus $\left| \bigcap_{i=1}^r Q_i \right| \geq 2\omega(G) - \left| \bigcup_{i=1}^r Q_i \right|$ giving a contradiction. $\square$

The second lemma we need is an improvement of Hajnal's result for graphs satisfying $\omega > \frac{2}{3}(\Delta + 1)$ due to Kostochka (see [7]). We give a new (simpler) proof of this result.

Clique Graph. Let G be a graph. For a collection of cliques $\mathcal{Q}$ in G , let $X_{\mathcal{Q}}$ be the intersection graph of $\mathcal{Q}$. That is, the vertex set of $X_{\mathcal{Q}}$ is $\mathcal{Q}$ and there is an edge between $Q_1 \neq Q_2 \in \mathcal{Q}$ if and only if Q_1 and Q_2 intersect.

Lemma 2. *Let G be a graph satisfying $\omega > \frac{2}{3}(\Delta + 1)$. If $\mathcal{Q}$ is a collection of maximum cliques in G such that $X_{\mathcal{Q}}$ is connected, then $X_{\mathcal{Q}}$ is complete.*

Proof. Let $Q_1, Q_2, Q_3 \in \mathcal{Q}$ be distinct and assume that $Q_1 \cap Q_2 \neq \emptyset$ and $Q_2 \cap Q_3 \neq \emptyset$. Then $|Q_1 \cap Q_2| = |Q_1| + |Q_2| - |Q_1 \cup Q_2| \geq 2\omega(G) - (\Delta(G) + 1)$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
|Q_1 \cap Q_3| &\geq |Q_1 \cap Q_2 \cap Q_3| \\
&\geq |Q_1 \cap Q_2| - (|Q_2| - |Q_2 \cap Q_3|) \\
&\geq 2\omega(G) - (\Delta(G) + 1) - (\omega(G) - (2\omega(G) - (\Delta(G) + 1))) \\
&= 3\omega(G) - 2(\Delta(G) + 1) > 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus $Q_1 \cap Q_3 \neq \emptyset$ showing that X_Q is transitive. The lemma follows since a transitive connected graph is complete. $\square$

Kostochka's Lemma. *Let G be a graph satisfying $\omega > \frac{2}{3}(\Delta + 1)$. If $\mathcal{Q}$ is a collection of maximum cliques in G such that X_Q is connected, then $\cap \mathcal{Q} \neq \emptyset$.*

Proof. Assume not and let $\mathcal{Q} = \{Q_1, \dots, Q_r\}$ be a bad collection of maximum cliques with r minimal. Then $r \geq 3$ and X_Q is complete by Lemma 2. Put $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{Q} - \{Q_1\}$. Then X_Z is connected and hence by minimality of r , we see that $\cap \mathcal{Z} \neq \emptyset$. In particular $|\cup \mathcal{Z}| \leq \Delta(G) + 1$. Thus

$$|\cup \mathcal{Q}| \leq |Q_1 - Q_2| + |\cup \mathcal{Z}| \leq 2(\Delta(G) + 1) - \omega(G) < 2\omega(G)$$

But then Lemma 1 gives a contradiction. $\square$

The third lemma we need is a result of Haxell (see [3]) on independent transversals.

Lemma 3. *Let k be a positive integer, let H be a graph of maximum degree at most k , and let $V(H) = V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_n$ be a partition of the vertex set of H . Suppose that $|V_i| \geq 2k$ for each i . Then H has an independent set $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ where $v_i \in V_i$ for each i .*

Proof of The Main Lemma. Let G be a graph satisfying $\omega \geq \frac{3}{4}(\Delta + 1)$. Let $\mathcal{Q}$ be the collection of all maximum cliques in G and let $\{\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_r\}$ be the vertex sets of the components of X_Q . For each i , put $F_i = \bigcap \mathcal{C}_i$. Then, by Lemma 1 and Kostochka's Lemma, we have $|F_i| \geq 2\omega(G) - (\Delta(G) + 1)$. Since every vertex $v \in F_i$ is in a maximum clique in $\bigcup \mathcal{C}_i$, v hits at most $\Delta(G) + 1 - \omega(G)$ vertices outside of $\bigcup \mathcal{C}_i$.

Let H be the graph with $V(H) = \bigcup_i F_i$ and an edge between $v, w \in V(H)$ if and only if $vw \in E(G)$ and v and w are in different F_i . Then, by the above,

$$\Delta(H) \leq \Delta(G) + 1 - \omega(G).$$

Consider the partition $\{F_i\}_i$ of $V(H)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} |F_i| &\geq 2\omega(G) - (\Delta(G) + 1) \\ &\geq 2\frac{3}{4}(\Delta(G) + 1) - (\Delta(G) + 1) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(\Delta(G) + 1) \\ &= 2(\Delta(G) + 1 - \frac{3}{4}(\Delta(G) + 1)) \\ &\geq 2(\Delta(G) + 1 - \omega(G)) \\ &\geq 2\Delta(H). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Lemma 3, H has an independent set $I = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ where $v_i \in F_i$ for each i . Since F_i was contained in each element of $\mathcal{C}_i$ we have $\omega(G - I) < \omega(G)$. $\square$

3 Proof of Theorem D

Theorem D is an easy consequence of The Main Lemma.

Proof of Theorem D. Assume (to reach a contradiction) that the theorem is false and let G be a counterexample with the minimum number of vertices. First assume that $\omega(G) \geq \frac{3}{4}(\Delta(G) + 1)$. Then by The Main Lemma we have an independent set I with $\omega(G - I) < \omega(G)$. Plainly, we may assume that I is maximal (and hence $\Delta(G - I) < \Delta(G)$). Put $H = G - I$. Then, by minimality of G , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \chi(G) &\leq 1 + \chi(H) \\ &\leq 1 + \left\lceil \frac{\omega(H) + \Delta(H) + 1}{2} \right\rceil \\ &\leq 1 + \left\lceil \frac{\omega(G) - 1 + \Delta(G) - 1 + 1}{2} \right\rceil \\ &\leq \left\lceil \frac{\omega(G) + \Delta(G) + 1}{2} \right\rceil. \end{aligned}$$

This is a contradiction, hence we must have $\omega(G) < \frac{3}{4}(\Delta(G) + 1)$. But then

$$\begin{aligned} \left\lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \right\rceil &\geq \chi(G) \\ &> \left\lceil \frac{\omega(G) + \Delta(G) + 1}{2} \right\rceil \\ &\geq \left\lceil \frac{\omega(G) + \frac{4}{3}\omega(G)}{2} \right\rceil \\ &= \left\lceil \frac{7}{6}\omega(G) \right\rceil. \end{aligned}$$

This final contradiction completes the proof. $\square$

References

- [1] A. Caprara and R. Rizzi. Improving a family of approximation algorithms to edge color multigraphs. *Information Processing Letters*, **68**, 1998, 11 - 15.
- [2] A. Hajnal. A theorem on k-saturated graphs. *Can. J. Math.*, **10(4)**, 1965, 720-724.
- [3] P. E. Haxell. A Note on Vertex List Colouring. *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*, **10(4)**, 2001, 345-347.
- [4] A. King, B. Reed, and A. Vetta. An upper bound for the chromatic number of line graphs. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, **28(8)**, 2007, 2182-2187.
- [5] A. King, B. Reed. Bounding χ in terms of ω and Δ for quasi-line graphs. *Journal of Graph Theory*, To Appear.
- [6] A. King. Claw-free graphs and two conjectures on ω , Δ , and χ . Thesis.
- [7] A. Kostochka. Degree, clique number, and chromatic number. *Metody Diskret. Anal.*, **35**, 1980, 45-70. [In Russian]

- [8] M. Molloy and B. Reed. Graph Coloring and the Probabilistic Method. *Springer-Verlag, Berlin*, 2000.
- [9] B. Reed. ω , Δ , and χ . *Journal of Graph Theory*, **27**, 1998, 177-212.